Applicants traverse these claim rejections as follows.


## II. Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

**A. Claims 1-6, 10-15 and 19-24 are not rendered obvious by a reasonable combination, if any, of Raman and Klein, under § 103(a).**

### Claims 1, 10 and 19

Claim 1 provides a method of accessing data at a server computer from a client computer connected via a network, the data being stored on a data storage device connected to the server computer. The method of claim 1 includes, "at the server computer, receiving a request for data from the client computer; determining whether the client computer can access the data in its stored form; when it is determined that the client computer cannot access the data in its stored form, converting the data into a form that the client computer can access; and returning a locator to the client computer for locating the converted data" (*see also* claims 10 and 19).

The Examiner alleges that Raman teaches all of these features, except returning a locator to the client computer for locating the converted data (Raman: Abstract; col. 1, line 10 to col. 2, line 62; and col. 3, lines 15-37). Furthermore, the Examiner alleges that Klein makes up for this acknowledged deficiency of Raman by teaching returning a URL to the client for the client to retrieve requested data from the appropriate location (Klein: col. 10, lines 45-65).

Applicants respectfully submit that a reasonable combination of Raman and Klein, if any, would not render claims 1, 10 or 19 obvious. Raman is fundamentally different from the method of claim 1 (*see also* claims 10 and 19).

-2-

For example and not by way of limitation, claim 1 recites "at the server computer, . . . determining whether the client computer can access the data in its stored form [and] when it is determined that the client computer cannot access the data in its stored form, converting the data [at the server storing the data] into a form that the client computer can access" (*see also* claims 10 and 19).

Conversely, in Raman, the client computer itself determines in what format the data is represented and whether the client has the resources to perform a desired function on the data in its current format (Raman: Abstract, claim 1). If the client computer does not have the resources to perform the desired function on the data in its current format, but the client computer does have the resources to perform the desired function on the data in a different format, the client computer searches for a parsing server that can convert the data from the first format to the second format (*Id.*). Upon locating a suitable parsing server, the data to be converted is transmitted to the parsing server and converted into the second format (*Id.*). Finally, the converted data is sent from the parsing server to the client computer, whereby the desired function can be performed on the converted data (*Id.*).

Consequently, this approach of Raman requires that each client computer system maintain numerous data structures in order to have data parsed from an unusable format into a usable format (Raman: Figs. 1b and 2; and col. 4, line 43 to col. 5, line 6).

Furthermore, this approach of Raman also requires the use of external parsing servers 20, which are different from a server storing data accessible by a client computer over a network, such as data servers 15 (Raman: Fig. 1a). This is a more inefficient approach (*e.g.*, increased

-3-

overhead) than integrating the conversion routines (*i.e.*, programs or modules) as part of the data storing server (*c.f., e.g.*, claims 1, 10 and 19).

In view of the above, Raman fails to teach or suggest the method of claim 1, including the steps of "at the server computer, receiving a request for data from the client computer; determining whether the client computer can access the data in its stored form; when it is determined that the client computer cannot access the data in its stored form, converting the data into a form that the client computer can access" (*see also* claims 10 and 19).

Further still, the Examiner fails to provide a reasonable suggestion or motivation (absent impermissible hindsight) from the references themselves or the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for combining Raman and Klein. The Examiner's purported motivation that such a combination "would have improved a load on the server by returning the locator to the client for the client locating the stored data in other storage such as [a] database and thereby decreased the number of steps of delivering data via the server which in turn will reduce the total traffics in the network" is flawed (*see* Office Action, page 3).

For example, even assuming *arguendo* that a combination of Raman and Klein would successfully allow a URL to be returned after a parsing server has converted the data from a first format into a second format, the data would still need to be requested and retrieved by the client computer system such that the desired function could be performed on the converted data (Raman: Abstract; claim 1). Consequently, requiring the client computer to request the converted data from the parsing server, as opposed to directly delivering the converted data from the parsing server to the client computer, would not result in a reduction of the total traffics in

-4-

the network 1a of Raman as alleged by the Examiner. Therefore, absent impermissible

hindsight, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Applicants' invention to combine Raman and Klein as alleged by the Examiner.

For at least the above exemplary reasons, claims 1, 10 and 19 are not rendered obvious by

a reasonable combination, if any, of Raman and Klein.

### Claims 2-6, 11-15 and 20-24

Claims 2-6, 11-15 and 20-24 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency, as well

as the additional features recited therein. For example and not by way of limitation, claim 4

recites the step of "before the step of retrieving the file, . . . determining whether the file

identifier is valid". The Examiner alleges that Raman describes this step at col. 5, lines 18-36.

To the contrary, Raman describes the steps taken by a client system in performing a given

function on a specific resource (Raman: col. 5, lines 25-65; Fig. 5). Thus, Raman relates to

finding a suitable parsing server (*Id.*; *c.f.*, Applicants' Specification at page 24-28). Raman fails

to teach or suggest any determination as to whether a file identifier is valid before attempting to

retrieve the file.

**B. Claims 7-9, 16-18 and 25-33 are not rendered obvious by a reasonable combination, if any, of Raman, Klein and Guck, under § 103(a).**

Guck fails to make up for the deficiencies of Raman and Klein, described above with

respect to claims 1, 10 and 19. Thus, claims 7-9, 16-18 and 25-33 are patentable over a

reasonable combination, if any, of Raman, Klein and Guck at least by virtue of their dependency.

Furthermore, with respect to claims 28-30, the Examiner acknowledges that Raman and Klein do not teach or suggest the features of these claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to clarify the basis of the rejection of claim 28-30, given the requirement that the references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations (*see* MPEP § 2143).

## III. Formal Matters

### A. *Priority*

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) from U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/107,395.

### B. *Information Disclosure Statement*

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging receipt and consideration of the references submitted with the IDS filed on September 14, 1999.

### C. *Drawings*

Applicants thank the Examiner for accepting the Resubmission of Drawings filed on August 28, 2002.

## IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Attorney Docket No. ST9-98-116/A8135
U.S. Application No. 09/376,880

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

*[signature: Billy Carter Raulerson]*

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC                          Billy Carter Raulerson
Telephone: (202) 293-7060                   Registration No. 52,156
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Date: September 4, 2003